

**REMARKS****I. Status of the Claims:**

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1, 3-8, 10-22, 25, and 28-34 will be pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 10, 25, and 31-34 are independent. Claims 1, 5, 8, 10, 19, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 34 are amended. Also, claims 2, 23, and 24 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112:**

Dependent claims 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being allegedly indefinite for omitting essential steps. In making this rejection, the Examiner states that it is unclear how the cell IDs recited in these claims are used to establish a geographical location. Claims 8 and 19 have been amended to recite that a cell ID indicates a wireless device's geographical location. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

**III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatenable over U.S. Patent No. 6,014,090 to Rosen et al. ("Rosen"), "UDDI Technical White Paper", and Tauber et al., *Surfing the Internet with Netscape Communicator 4* ("Tauber"). In addition, claims 10-25 and 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Rosen, "UDDI: an XML web service.", and Tauber. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 25, 31, and 33 each include caching features. These claims further recite that this caching is “for selective forwarding to the user's wireless device.” In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Tauber as allegedly disclosing this feature. In particular, the Examiner states on page 7 of the Office Action that Tauber (at page 78) discloses “caching files accessed from web sites, for selective forwarding to the user device, where websites are stored in a cache, and are forwarded to the user when he or she requests them.” However, the cache in Tauber appears to be a local cache. Therefore, this cache is not “for selective forwarding to the user device”, as recited in these independent claims.

In addition, these claims recite a sorting feature in which documents are sorted in accordance with a user's profile or location. The Examiner asserts on page 20 of the Office Action that this feature is disclosed by Tauber at pages 106-107 and at Figure 4.6. However, this sorting is not in accordance with a user's profile or location. Instead, this sorting is based on actual user interaction that causes items in a history window to be sorted at the time of the user interaction.

Independent claims 10, 32, and 34 have been amended to recite a replay feature. A similar feature was previously recited in dependent claim 24 (now canceled). According to this feature, updated geographical information is used. The Examiner asserts On page 16 of the Office Action that Rosen discloses such a replay feature at column 6, lines 40-45. Applicants respectfully disagree. This passage in Rosen addresses further activity based on a previous search. However, this further activity in Rosen is not a replay. Instead, this further activity (which occurs after time-dependent, geographically localized information has been provided to a user) involves “further” (i.e., different) “selections to obtain more specific information.”

In making this assertion, the Examiner appears to focus on the “dynamically updated” language found in this portion of Rosen. However, this passage merely involves the dynamic nature of information from the perspective of a resource server and not the replay of a search handle, as recited in claim 10.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants assert that independent claims 1, 10, 25, and 31-34 (as well as their respective dependent claims) are distinguishable over the references applied by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims and allowance of this application.

**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4010.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4010.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: 8/9/05

By: John A. Harroun

John A. Harroun  
Registration No. 46,339  
(202) 857-7887 Telephone  
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

**Correspondence Address:**

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101